

VII. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

VII. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

There have been seven interagency review meetings regarding the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project.

- On March 15, 1995, the interagency review meeting purpose was one of a series of three kick off meetings fulfilling MIS requirements. Other than the interagency meeting, a separate kick off meeting occurred for both Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) and the public. The project team prepared the purpose and need in preparation for a May presentation. The project team was defined as consisting of representatives of State Highway Administration (SHA), Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), US Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Frederick and Montgomery Counties, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MNCPPC), Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), National Park Service (NPS), Maryland Historic Trust (MHT), Maryland Department of Planning (MDP), US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and National Marine Fisheries (NMF). The MIS process was outlined at the meeting as well as a tentative project timeline, including the extent of analysis and agency roles. The qualitative and quantitative Measures of Effectiveness were given in broad categories and their purpose for eliminating some of the proposed strategies was explained. A key emphasis at this meeting was addressing the differences between the current MIS approach and process from previous procedures.
- On June 21, 1995, the interagency review meeting purpose was to present future scenarios in the I-270 corridor, especially the results of a no build alternative. Representatives from SHA, MTA, MDOT, DNR, COE, MNCPPC, FHWA, MDE, NPS, MHT, MDP, USFWS, NMF, MWCOG, and WMATA were in attendance. Travel demand modeling assumptions were discussed, such as the direction of travel relative to the corridor studied. Environmental resources were presented, including wetlands, 100-year flood plain regions, and adjacent parklands to the corridor.
- On November 20, 1996, the interagency review purpose was to detail various elements of the transportation strategies being developed. Representatives from SHA, MTA, MDOT, DNR, COE, MNCPPC, FHWA, MDE, NPS, MHT, MDP, USFWS, NMF, MWCOG, and WMATA were in attendance. The meeting began with an overview of events thus far regarding the I-270/US15 project and overview of previous meetings held. Strategy components eliminated included a light rail transitway to Frederick and Clarksburg. Other options were discussed, such as extending lane widening that would take place south of the project area and possible HOV additions.

- On October 21, 1998, the interagency review meeting included representatives from SHA, MTA, MDOT, MDP, FHWA, FTA, Montgomery and Frederick Counties, the Cities of Rockville, City of Gaithersburg, and City of Frederick, the MNCPPC, WMATA, and MWCOG. The purpose of the meeting was to present the evaluation of the stand-alone transit options following the March 1997 Public Workshop. Alternatives being considered were discussed along with their various transit components. Some concern was raised over preliminary wetland impacts, but this was deemed a worst-case scenario.
- On December 16, 1998, the interagency review meeting purpose was to receive agency comments on the scope and methodologies for the secondary and cumulative effects (SCEA) analysis. Representatives from SHA, MTA, MDOT, DNR, COE, MNCPPC, FHWA, MDE, NPS, MHT, MDP, USFWS, NMF, MWCOG, and WMATA were in attendance. Agency representatives requested a map of SCEA boundaries with an explanation of the boundary selection.
- On January 17, 2001, the interagency review meeting purpose was to update the agency representatives on the alternates retained for detailed study. Representatives from SHA, MTA, MDOT, DNR, COE, MNCPPC, FHWA, MDE, NPS, MHT, MDP, USFWS, NMF, MWCOG, and WMATA were in attendance. The No-Build alternative along with three build alternates were presented in light of their ability to relieve congestion and improve safety.
- On June 20, 2001, the interagency review meeting included representatives from SHA, BMC, EPA, FHWA, MDP, DNR, and COE. The purpose was to present the alternates considered. The alternates had been renamed to simplify and clarify the presentation of each alternate. Only a few comments were raised for clarification of specific alternate components.

INTERAGENCY FIELD COORDINATION

Four Maryland State Highway Administration Interagency Field Review Meetings have been held for the I-270 / US 15 project. Enclosed is a summary of the various field meetings.

- On November 13, 1995, an interagency field review was held to survey the I-270/US 15 corridor and associated environmental and cultural features. In attendance were representatives from US Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Frederick County Department of Planning, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), SHA and Rummel, Klepper & Kahl (RK&K). Widening alternatives were described along the route with areas of close development along the right-of-way and 100 year flood plain impacts identified. The parks located within the project area were identified as well as transitway alignments in the proximity of the Shady Grove Metro Station located at the southern boundary of the project area.

- On May 1, 1997, an interagency field review was held to review the combination alternates and to identify points of interest for the detailed engineering and environmental assessment. In attendance were representatives from FHWA, SHA, Parsons Brinckerhoff and RK&K. Of primary focus were various I-270 and US 15 interchanges with other major arterial roads. Structures and traffic configurations were also discussed. It was determined that the National Park Service would be contacted regarding Monocacy National Battlefield Park to discuss Section 4(f) issues once I-270 widening impacts had been assessed.
- On July 24, 1997, an interagency field review was held with the purpose to survey the I-270/US 15 Corridor and associated natural, social, and cultural environmental features with respect to the alternates under consideration. In attendance were representatives from Frederick County Planning, Maryland-National Capital Parks and Planning Commission, Montgomery County Department of Public Works, US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), Maryland Historic Trust, Maryland Department of Planning, Maryland Department of Transportation, COE, SHA, and RK&K present future scenarios in the I-270 corridor, especially the results of a no build alternative. Travel demand modeling assumptions were discussed, such as the direction of travel relative to the corridor studied. Environmental resources were presented, including wetlands, 100-year flood plain regions, and adjacent parklands to the corridor.
- On April 25, 26 and May 2,3, 2001 an interagency field review meeting was held to discuss potential wetlands mitigation sites. In attendance were representatives from Environmental Protection Agency, COE, Department of Natural Resources, MDE, SHA, and RK&K. Sites reviewed had been proposed as compensation for unavoidable impacts to wetlands and waterways resulting from the subject project. A total of 16 sites on various properties were investigated. A total of 8 prospective sites were given a preliminary estimate of wetland mitigation credits.

Summary of Public Involvement

The State Highway Administration and Maryland Transit Administration have met with citizens to discuss the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study on several occasions in the form of workshops or focus group meetings that were open to the public. In support of public awareness of these meetings and their purpose, various newsletters and brochures were distributed along with press releases to the general public. At the public meetings, citizens were invited to provide verbal or private written testimony and comments concerning the material presented at the meeting or comments on the project in general.

- At the outset of the project, a public initiation meeting was held in May of 1995. Approximately 104 people were in attendance. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the process and goals for the project and receive comments on various aspects of the study. The meeting, conducted in workshop format, with details provided about aspects of the project at various information stations, provided information on the environment, regional growth, travel forecasting, land use and transportation strategies, such as HOV lanes, general use lanes and transit. The public was especially interested in

widening of the I-270 corridor as well as new transit and transportation options integrated along the route. A presentation, similar to the one given at this public meeting, was given to the MWCOC Transportation Planning Board on March 15, 1995, as part of the MIS requirement to initiate the project with the MPO. MWCOC concurred on the scope of this project in April 1995.

- Public alternates workshops were held in December of 1995 and January of 1996. Approximately 50 persons attended the first workshop, which was held in December in Montgomery County. In January, the workshop was held in Frederick County where approximately 100 people attended. The meetings shared the progress of the study with the public and gained feedback on the initial results of the transportation strategies analyses (HOV and general use lanes, a Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) alignment, extended feeder and express bus services, transportation system and demand management strategies, etc.). The analyses showed that no single strategy, alone, would satisfy the transportation needs within the Corridor but a combination of strategies are necessary. Topics such as the purpose and need statement, the preliminary alternates and strategies, economic growth/public investment, mobility/goods movement, and the environment were presented at these meetings.
- Additional alternates workshops were held in March of 1997. The purpose of these meetings was to present the progress of the study to the public and to gain feedback on the additional results of the transportation strategies analyses. These analyses yielded the investigation of additional strategies, such as extended Collector-Distributor (C-D) lanes, premium express bus service, proposed new interchanges and a new roadway called Technology Boulevard in Frederick County (which was later removed from consideration within this study). The workshops were also for receiving official public comment on corridor preservation strategies and right-of-way needs for the future transportation alternates. The public comments reflected approval for multi-modal aspect of the project alternates. Many additional issues the public expressed interest in were Transportation Demand Management options and additional transit and highway expansion and enhancement.
- Two informational public meeting were held for the project in February 2001. The purpose of the meetings was to present recent information regarding the project. This included more detailed engineering plans of highway and transitway alignments, preliminary right-of-way and environmental impacts, preliminary cost estimates, and finally, traffic conditions for the 2020 Build and No Build Scenarios. Public comment was very design oriented with many suggestions about new and enhanced interchange alignments along the I-270 corridor as well as specific right-of-way impacts. Questions about the integration with other local studies, such as express bus and MARC commuter rail were also raised.

Further public interaction has included a focus group of local members of the communities within the project area. A focus group was formed in 1995 to review and offer input for the many transportation improvement options and evaluation measures. The focus group met approximately four times per year with a total of 20 focus group meetings having been held for this project. The focus group convened at intervals throughout the study to review and offer

input for the many transportation improvement options and evaluation measures. The focus group consists of approximately 20 members of business and community representatives in the project area.

Organizations represented in the focus group and others in attendance at the focus group meetings include representatives from SHA, MTA, Maryland-National Capital Parks and Planning Commission, Frederick County Planning, Frederick County TransIT, Montgomery County Department of Public Works, Sierra Club, Maryland Motor Trucking Association, Clarksburg Civic Association, Montgomery County, Urbana Civic Association, Greater Shady Grove Civic Alliance, Worman's Mill Civic Association, Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board, Friends of Monocacy Battlefield, Action Committee for Transit, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), American Automobile Association (Potomac Region), Kentlands Citizen Assembly, Frederick Area Committee on Transportation (FACT) – Highway, Transportation Services Advisory Council (TSAG), Kentlands, Rodgers and Associates, Inc., Germantown Citizens Association, Action Committee on Transit (ACT), Frederick County Chamber of Commerce, Upcounty Regional Services Center, Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board, and Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce

- The initial focus group meeting was held on April 24, 1995 at SHA District 7 office in Buckeystown, Maryland. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the project team, define the role of the focus group, and familiarize the group with the process and goals of the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Study.
- On June 20, 1995, the focus group meeting was held at the Upcounty Government Center in Germantown, Maryland, to discuss master plans and related studies in the I-270 study area. The MTA presented a summary of the MARC Master Plans, including improvements within the I-270 corridor. Montgomery County presented its general plans, transit easements studies, and individual area master plans. The Frederick and Urbana master plans and the Frederick extension of the transit easement study were presented. The focus group agreed that a combination of the alternatives would ultimately be necessary to solve the corridor's transportation problems.
- On August 30, 1995, the focus group meeting was held at the SHA's District 7 office. The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) presented an overview of the Congestion Management System (CMS) requirements and how they will be applied in the project corridor. The meeting also served to define and develop the goals and objectives for the study. Subsequently, the project team met to discuss the focus group comments and concerns regarding the goal and objectives, and develop corresponding Measures Of Effectiveness (MOE).
- On September 20, 1995, the focus group meeting was held at the Clarksburg Recreation Center in Clarksburg, Maryland. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss revisions to the project goals and objectives.
- On October 24, 1995, the focus group met to discuss revisions to the project goals and objectives, MOE, and the material to be presented at the December 1995 alternates workshops.

- On December 5, 1996, the focus group meeting was held at the SHA's District 7 office. Discussion topics included a study overview, travel demand analyses, preliminary combination alternatives, design features under construction, an environmental overview, public workshop/hearing plans, project schedule and upcoming meetings.
- On February 19, 1997, the focus group meeting was held at the Upcounty Government Center. The purpose of the meeting was to review the display materials for the alternate workshops.
- On May 21, 1997, the focus group meeting was held at SHA's District 7 office. The purpose of the meeting was to update the focus group on the progress of the study and to obtain feedback from the workshops held in March.
- On July 30, 1997, the focus group meeting was held at the Upcounty Government Center in Montgomery County. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the assumptions for the travel demand model for the stand-alone transit options. MTA presented the three stand-alone transit options and discussed their methods of evaluation.
- On September 17, 1997, the focus group meeting was held at the SHA District 7 office. The purpose of the meeting was to update the travel demand schedule for modeling and assessment of the stand-alone transit options. A review of goals and objectives, and MOE, were also conducted.
- On February 24, 1998, the focus group meeting was held at the Upcounty Government Center in Montgomery County. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update for the transit option land use forecasts and travel demand work.
- On April 23, 1998, the focus group meeting was held at the SHA District 7 office. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the initial results of the transit options. Comments were received on updated MOE tables.
- On July 9, 1998, the focus group meeting was held at the Upcounty Government Center in Montgomery County. The purpose was to discuss the results of the transit options and discuss recommendations for the transit component and for the alternates that should be carried into the more detailed planning studies.
- On December 17, 1998, the focus group meeting was held with the purpose to discuss the alternates retained for detailed study. A review of the project planning process was presented as a benchmark and ongoing environmental activities were reviewed.
- On May 27, 1999, the focus group meeting was held with the purpose to discuss the current alternates considered along with any modifications, review of the travel demand forecasts completed, and ongoing environmental and engineering activities of the project planning study.

- On August 12, 1999, the focus group meeting was held at the Upcounty Government Center in Montgomery County. The purpose of the meeting was to provide and discuss further details on the alternates retained for detailed engineering and environmental studies. Sectional diagrams received comments and travel modeling efforts and transit mode strategies were elaborated.
- On February 3, 2000, the focus group meeting was held at the SHA District 7 office. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss travel demand issues and preliminary results, engineering issues, and future informational public workshops. The concept of value pricing as a method to manage travel demand was also presented.
- On August 1, 2000, the focus group meeting was held at the Upcounty Government Center in Montgomery County. The purpose of the meeting was to review the stages of the complex travel demand effort and next steps and to discuss products in anticipation of upcoming informational public workshops.
- On October 26, 2000, the focus group meeting was held at the SHA District 7 office. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the preliminary highway and transit designs, traffic, upcoming travel demand modeling assumptions and the project schedule.
- • On May 31, 2001, the focus group meeting was held at the Upcounty Government Center in Montgomery County. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss citizen comments from the February 2001 informational public meetings, modifications to be made and the next step in travel demand modeling.

Newsletters and brochures were distributed in November 1995, November 1996, March 1997, Fall 1997 and January 2001 summarizing the study activities, promoting upcoming public meetings/workshops and updating the study's progress. These newsletters were distributed to the study's mailing list of approximately 3,000 individuals/organizations. In addition, newspaper articles, advertisements, radio/cable television interviews and press releases were utilized to keep the public aware of the study's activities and progress and to increase public awareness.

The I-270/US 15 project team has used various methods of advertising project activities to the public including the following newspapers and periodicals:

- The Baltimore Sun
- The Washington Post
- The Montgomery Gazette
- The Montgomery Journal
- The Afro-American (Washington, DC)
- El Montgomery
- The Asian Fortune
- The Washington Jewish Week
- The Frederick News Post
- The Frederick Gazette

Public notices, as well as posters/postcards at local stores and libraries, were used to announce the public meetings/workshops. Public outreach initiatives were extended to further publicize the study activities to the citizens, civic associations and organizations within the project area. Examples of these groups include the Frederick County Chamber of Commerce, the Urbana Civic Association, the Clarksburg Civic Association, the Shady Grove Alliance, and citizens from the Town of Hyattstown.

Correspondence and Coordination

Correspondence regarding this project is included in this Chapter. The information has been organized into the following categories:

- A. Agency Correspondence
- B. Community Coordination
- C. Streamlined Process Agency Correspondence
- D. Elected Officials
- E. Minutes.

An index of the information presented follows.

A. Agency Correspondence

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
01.21.96	US Department of the Navy	SHA	Support for HOV lanes and interest in the development of park & ride lots.	VII-A-1
03.12.97	SHA	US Department of the Navy	Response to the 01.21.96 correspondence regarding development of park & ride lots.	VII-A-2
06.24.97	SHA	US Department of the Navy	Montgomery County shuttle bus service, Montgomery County planned park & ride lots associated with a future Corridor Cities Transitway, and potential park & ride locations adjacent to I-270.	VII-A-3
04.17.97	M-NCPPC	SHA	Montgomery County Department of Park and Planning concerns regarding the March 26 draft recommendations: 1) Premium Bus Service in Combination B, 2) Separation of the CCT from the rest of the study, and 3) the ability of MTA to fund and staff development of a DEIS.	VII-A-4
06.17.97	SHA	M-NCPPC	Response to concerns stated in the 04.17.97 correspondence.	VII-A-5
07.31.97	SHA	M-NCPPC	Response to Montgomery County Planning Board concerns.	VII-A-6
10.27.99	M-NCPPC	SHA	Requesting comments on an adjustment made to the CCT alignment in the Shady Grove Planning Area.	VII-A-7
11.08.99	SHA	M-NCPPC	Response to 10.27.99 comments regarding proposed shifts to the CCT alignment.	VII-A-8
07.24.00	M-NCPPC	SHA	Montgomery County Planning Board requests the extension of Metrorail service from Shady Grove to Gaithersburg.	VII-A-9
08.21.00	SHA	M-NCPPC	Response to 07.24.00 Montgomery County Planning Board request to extend Metrorail service from Shady Grove to Gaithersburg.	VII-A-10
06.04.01	M-NCPPC	SHA	Request that New Cut Road Interchange include access to the west to support implementation of the Clarksburg Master Plan.	VII-A-11
06.29.01	SHA	M-NCPPC	Response to 06.04.01 M-NCPPC request for western access at the New Cut Road/I-270 interchange. SHA requests a written commitment from Montgomery County to minimize development outside of the PFA.	VII-A-12
06.17.96	M-NCPPC	SHA	Providing information on the following park and recreation areas: Middlebrook Hill Conservation Area, Black Hills Regional Park, Little Bennet Regional Park, and Ridge Road Recreational Park.	VII-A-13
01.29.02	SHA	M-NCPPC	Response to 06.29.96 letter, providing information on Middlebrook Hill Conservation Area and requesting updated information on all park and recreation resources under M-NCPPC jurisdiction.	VII-A-17
04.08.02	M-NCPPC	SHA	Recommending I-270 crossing locations for the Countywide Park Trails Plan	VII-A-18
10.13.98	FHWA	SHA	Comments on the draft package distributed at the 09.16.98 Interagency Review Meeting.	VII-A-22
04.30.02	SHA	FHWA	Letter requesting FHWA to advise Advisory Council on Historic Preservation of impacts	VII-A-24

A. Agency Correspondence (Continued)

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
08.08.97	TransIT	SHA	Comments on the stand-alone transit option presented at the August 1997 focus group meeting.	VII-A-31
07.22.96	City of Gaithersburg	SHA	Providing information on City parks and facilities.	VII-A-32
12.18.96	City of Gaithersburg	SHA	Providing a map that locates all City of Gaithersburg recreation facilities and parks.	VII-A-33
11.20.97	City of Gaithersburg	SHA	City of Gaithersburg study of additional access from I-270 to MD 117. Requesting traffic volume data for this use in their study.	VII-A-34
12.05.97	SHA	City of Gaithersburg	Response to 11.29.97 letter providing a general project description, project schedule and stating that projections of future traffic volumes by MWCOC will be coordinated with the City.	VII-A-35
07.16.98	City of Gaithersburg	SHA	Clarification of City of Gaithersburg's endorsement of a transit alignment.	VII-A-36
08.25.98	SHA	City of Gaithersburg	Response to 07.16.98 letter.	VII-A-37
06.17.97	US EPA	FHWA	EPA's agreement to participate as a Cooperating Agency I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Study.	VII-A-38
11.06.96	National Park Service	SHA	Providing information and documents pertaining to Monocacy National Battlefield.	VI-A-39
02.23.98	National Park Service	SHA	Addressing access permission protocol required prior to accessing the Monocacy National Battlefield property including Goisbert Farm for the purpose of environmental investigations, including archaeological investigations.	VII-A-43
03.17.98	SHA	National Park Service	Response to 02.23.98 letter.	VII-A-44
10.23.98	National Park Service	SHA	Comments pertaining to Monocacy National Battlefield, including Section 106 and Section 4(f) issues.	VII-A-45
10.29.98	SHA	National Park Service	Response to 10.23.98 email letter.	VII-A-45
01.27.99	National Park Service	SHA	Comments on the Secondary and Cumulative Effects Analysis (SCEA) boundary.	VII-A-46
02.12.99	SHA	National Park Service	Antietam National Battlefield comments on the Secondary and Cumulative Effects Analysis (SCEA) boundary.	VII-A-47
03.01.00	National Park Service	SHA	Stating the National Park Service has reviewed the Archaeological report pertaining to Monocacy National Battlefield and has no comments.	VII-A-48
04.17.02	SHA	National Park Service	Regarding the NEPA, Section 4(f) and Section 106 processes and Monocacy National Battlefield.	VII-A-49
12.20.00	USFWS	Project Team.	Comments regarding federally listed or proposed for listing endangered or threatened species within the vicinity of the study area.	VII-A-51
04.24.97	Maryland Historical Trust	SHA	Providing update of previously recorded properties and determination of eligibility.	VII-A-52
11.30.98	MD DHCD	SHA	Comments regarding the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study.	VII-A-53

A. Agency Correspondence (Continued)

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
11.05.99	Maryland DHCD	SHA	Comments on the Phase IB Archaeological Survey report.	VII-A-54
09.05.01	SHA	Maryland Historical Trust	Informing MHT of project changes made following 1999 consultation.	VII-A-55
02.15.02	SHA	Maryland Historical Trust	Regarding findings of adverse effects to historic properties and draft Memorandum of Agreement (see page VII-A-122)	VII-A-65
04.29.02	Maryland DHCD	SHA	Comment on revised Area of Potential Effect	VII-A-71
09.13.95	Maryland DNR	SHA	Presence of finfish in the vicinity of the study area.	VII-A-72
04.24.96	Maryland DNR	SHA	Comments regarding Seneca Creek State Park and Urbana Lake Fish Management Area.	VII-A-75
03.19.99	Maryland DNR	SHA	Comments provided on Secondary and Cumulative Effects Analysis (SCEA) boundary and time frame.	VII-A-76
04.20.99	SHA	Maryland DNR	Response to 03.19.99 comments provided regarding the SCEA boundary and time frame.	VII-A-77
03.14.02	SHA	Maryland Historical Trust	Correction to impacts chart	VII-A-78
03.22.02	Maryland DNR	SHA	Providing information on Urbana Fish Management Area and Seneca Creek State Park.	VII-A-81
04.03.02	Maryland DNR	SHA	Seneca Creek State Park visitation records	VII-A-82
12.27.00	Maryland DNR	Project Team.	Rare, threatened and endangered species of plants and animals within study area.	VII-A-83
03.05.01	Maryland DNR	Project Team.	Additional information on rare, threatened and endangered species of plants and animals within study area.	VII-A-85
08.24.98	Maryland Department of Planning	SHA/MTA	Comments of the Draft Stage I Transportation Summary	VII-A-87
12.07.98	Maryland Department of Planning	SHA	Additional comments of the Alternates Retained for Detailed Study regarding land use/growth management strategies.	VII-A-89
01.04.99	SHA	Maryland Department of Planning	Response to comments on the Alternates Retained for Detailed Study regarding land use/growth management, baseline modified alternate and smart growth.	VII-A-90
10.15.98	SHA	Maryland Department of Planning	Response to comments provided in August 24, 1998 memorandum.	VII-A-92
02.26.99	Maryland Department of Planning	SHA	Comments on the Secondary and Cumulative Effects Analysis (SCEA) scoping approach.	VII-A-95
04.20.99	SHA	Maryland Department of Planning	Response to 02.26.99 letter.	VII-A-97
04.18.96	Frederick County	SHA	Park facilities within the study area, specifically Rose Hill Manor Park and Urbana Community Park.	VII-A-98
10.28.99	Frederick County	SHA	Comments regarding the Frederick County portions of the improvements.	VII-A-99

A. Agency Correspondence (Continued)

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
12.06.99	SHA	Frederick County	Response to the review of the draft engineering plans.	VII-A-100
05.09.95	City of Frederick	SHA	Providing comments on information presented at the May 8, 1995 Public Information Meeting.	VII-A-101
03.19.97	City of Frederick	SHA	Providing information of City park and recreation areas.	VII-A-102
10.08.96	USACOE	FHWA	USACOE agreement to participate as a cooperating agency.	VII-A-104
03.23.99	USACOE	SHA	Regarding jurisdictional determination conducted April 30 th through May 1 st and October 22 nd and 23 rd 1999.	VII-A-105
09.08.99	USACOE	SHA	Regarding jurisdictional determination conducted July 7 th and 8 th 1999.	VII-A-106
09.15.99	USACOE	MTA	Regarding concerns with the CCT alignment in relation to jurisdictional wetlands.	VII-A-108
12.01.99	MTA	USACOE	Recommended avoidance alternatives for CCT at proposed I-270/Watkins Mill Road Extended Interchange.	VII-A-109
04.28.00	USACOE	MTA	Regarding continued coordination of CCT alignment impacts to jurisdictional wetlands.	VII-A-110
07.07.00	MTA	USACOE	Regarding continued coordination of the USACOE on the project team and providing a schedule of upcoming project team meetings.	VII-A-111
02.23.00	SHA	City of Frederick	Regarding interchange options along US 15 in the vicinity of Trading Lane.	VII-A-112
05.02.00	Montgomery County Department of Police	SHA	Concerns regarding vehicular safety and emergency response along I-270/US-15 corridor.	VII-A-113
05.04.00	Frederick County Department of Fire/Rescue Services	SHA	Regarding emergency response times.	VII-A-114
08.21.00	SHA	Frederick County Public Schools	Regarding traffic operations at the intersection of US 15/Hayward Road/Worman's Mill Road.	VII-A-115
09.26.01	Montgomery County	Not addressed	Draft Transitway Yard and Shop Options and Comparison.	VII-A-116
10.02.01	WMATA	Project Team	Comments provided regarding Draft Transitway Yard and Shop Options and Comparison, dated September 26, 2001.	VII-A-118
10.10.01	WMATA	Project Team	Comments regarding conceptual designs for the proposed transitway alignment interface at Shady Grove Metro station.	VII-A-120
08.22.01	SHA		Draft Memorandum of Agreement.	VII-A-122
05.07.02	Natural Resources Conservation Service	Project Team	Cover letter for Farmland Conversion Impacting Rating Form	VII-A-127

B. Community Coordination

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
03.17.97	Audubon Naturalist Society	SHA	Comments on the Alternates Retained for Detailed Study at the March.1997 Alternates Workshops and Public Hearings.	VII-B-1
05.09.97	SHA	Audubon Naturalist Society	Response to the March 17, 1997 letter.	VII-B-2
03.22.97	STIR!	SHA	Comments on the Alternates Retained for Detailed Study at the March.1997 Alternates Workshops and Public Hearings.	VII-B-3
06.27.97	SHA	STIR!	Response to the March 22, 1997 letter.	VII-B-4
03.26.97	Hagerstown Telework Center	SHA	Proposal to consider telecommunicating as a transportation alternative	VII-B-5
05.13.97	SHA	Hagerstown Telework Center	Response to March 26, 1997 letter.	VII-B-6
08.05.97	ACT	SHA	Options, assumptions, fares, and operating parameters for the Transit Sensitivity Analysis.	VII-B-7
08.27.97	MTA	ACT	Response to August 5, 1997 letter.	VII-B-8
09.28.97	ACT	SHA	Comments regarding the transit model assumptions.	VII-B-9
10.22.97	SHA	ACT	Response to September 28, 1997 letter.	VII-B-10
06.20.97	ACT	Not addressed	ACT Resolution presented at the June 20, 1997 focus group meeting.	VII-B-11
8.29.95	SHA	ACT	Response to ACT Resolution.	VII-B-12
04.97	ACT	SHA	ACT Position Paper on the I-270 Multi-Modal Corridor Study.	VII-B-14
04.21.97	SHA	ACT	Response to ACT Position Paper.	VII-B-15
08.27.97	MTA	ACT	Response to the three transit options, Urbana stop for MTA bus line, and 'one or two minute headway' proposed by ACT.	VII-B-17
02.14.99	Clarksburg Civic Association	SHA	Invitation to address the Civic Association meeting scheduled for April 26, 1999.	VII-B-18
05.05.99	SHA	Clarksburg Civic Association	Review of Clarksburg Civic Association comments received at the April 26, 1999 association meeting.	VII-B-19
06.17.01	Clarksburg Civic Association	Governor of Maryland	Clarksburg Civic Association resolution regarding the transit terminus at COMSAT.	VII-B-21
10.05.01	MDOT	Clarksburg Civic Association	Brief description of the COMSAT transit terminus and an update of the proposed project.	VII-B-23

B. Community Coordination (Continued)

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
05.29.00	Dickerson Community Association	SHA	Regarding congestion and traffic safety issues associated with MD 28.	VII-B-24
06.12.00	SHA	Dickerson Community Association	Response to May 29, 2000 letter.	VII-B-25
02.17.00	FACT	MTA	Regarding MARC heavy rail service from Frederick to Shady Grove.	VII-B-26
08.16.99	Manor Lake Civic Association	SHA	Support for light rail along the CCT transitway.	VII-B-28
09.29.99	SHA	Manor Lake Civic Association	Response to August 16, 1999 letter.	VII-B-29
06.22.98	Stratford Mews Community Association	US House of Representatives	Request to Representative Constance A. Morella for information on how the project may impact the community.	VII-B-30
07.28.98	Maryland -National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Stratford Mews Community Association	Response to June 22, 1998 letter.	VII-B-31
02.28.97	SHA	Urbana Civic Association	Regarding traffic conditions at the southern intersection of MD-355 and MD-80.	VII-B-32
10.23.98	Worman's Mill Civic Association	SHA	Regarding proposed MD-26/US 15 interchange.	VII-B-33
11.25.98	SHA	Worman's Mill Civic Association	Response to Associations concerns regarding proposed MD 26/US 15 interchange.	VII-B-34
09.11.00	SHA	Alliance for Political Reform	Regarding traffic noise affecting the Waterford Community adjacent to the US-15/MD-144 interchange.	VII-B-36
07.05.01	SHA	Captain Jeff Gross Volunteer Fire Department	Response to comments submitted at the February 20, 2001 Informational Public Meeting regarding the existing I-270/MD 109 interchange, the proposed I-270/New Cut Road interchange and possible impacts to the Hyattstown Volunteer Fire Department Carnival Grounds.	VII-B-38
03.27.01	SHA	General Distribution	Request for public involvement in the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Study.	VII-B-39
02.21.02	SHA	Montgomery County Community College	Requesting information regarding the school property including mapping and information on recreational facilities.	VII-B-41

B. Community Coordination (Continued)

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
04.12.02	Urbana Elementary School	SHA	Regarding potential right-of-way impacts to the school property.	VII-B-42
08.18.95	SHA	SHA	Minutes from June 20, 1995 focus group meeting	VII-B-43
09.13.95	SHA	SHA	Minutes from August 30, 1995 focus group meeting	VII-B-45
03.11.96	SHA	SHA	October 24, 1995 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-47
12.24.96	SHA	SHA	December 5, 1996 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-50
02.24.97	SHA	SHA	February 19, 1997 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-53
07.18.97	SHA	SHA	May 21, 1997 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-54
08.11.97	SHA	SHA	July 30, 1997 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-56
10.30.97	SHA	SHA	September 17, 1997 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-59
03.09.98	SHA	SHA	February 24, 1998 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-61
06.04.98	SHA	SHA	April 23, 1998 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-63
07.20.98	SHA	SHA	July 9, 1998 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-65
12.21.98	SHA	SHA	December 17, 1998 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-68
06.08.99	SHA	SHA	May 27, 1999 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-71
08.31.99	SHA	SHA	August 12, 1999 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-74
03.07.00	SHA	SHA	February 3, 1999 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-76
08.21.00	SHA	SHA	August 1, 1999 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-81
10.31.00	SHA	SHA	October 26, 2000 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-84
07.09.01	SHA	SHA	May 31, 2001 focus group meeting minutes.	VII-B-87

C. Streamlined Process Agency Correspondence

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
09.05.95	SHA	FHWA	FHWA concurrence on Purpose and Need, November 1, 1995.	VII-C-1
09.05.95	SHA	USACOE	USACOE concurrence on Purpose and Need, September 18, 1995.	VII-C-2
09.05.95	SHA	US Department of the Interior	USFWS concurrence on Purpose and Need, September 23, 1995.	VII-C-3
09.05.95	SHA	US EPA	US EPA concurrence on Purpose and Need, October 23, 1995.	VII-C-4
09.05.95	SHA	MD SHPO	MHT concurrence on Purpose and Need, September 28, 1995.	VII-C-5
10.30.95	Maryland Department of Planning	SHA	Comments regarding the Purpose and Need statement.	VII-C-6
12.19.96	SHA	MD Department of Planning	Response to October 30, 1995 letter addressing Purpose and Need statement and Measures of effectiveness.	VII-C-8
11.04.98	SHA	MDE	MDE concurrence on Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, November 19, 1998.	VII-C-11
12.17.98	SHA	Maryland DNR	DNR concurrence on Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, December 19, 1998.	VII-C-12
Not dated	SHA	US EPA	US EPA concurrence on Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, December 21, 1998.	VII-C-13
11.04.98	SHA	FHWA	FHWA concurrence on Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, December 9, 1998.	VII-C-14
11.04.98	SHA	USACOE	USACOE concurrence (with comments attached) on Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, December 7, 1998.	VII-C-15
12.07.98	USACOE	SHA	USACOE comments regarding the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study.	VII-C-16
05.19.99	SHA	FHWA	FHWA concurrence (with comments attached) on amendment to Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, June 15, 1999.	VII-C-18
06.15.99	FHWA	FHWA	FHWA internal memorandum regarding HOV and HOT lanes.	VII-C-19
07.13.99	SHA	FHWA	Response to June 15, 1999 comments.	VII-C-20
05.19.99	SHA	USACOE	USACOE concurrence on amendment to Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, June 7, 1999.	VII-C-21
05.19.99	SHA	US EPA	US EPA concurrence on amendment to Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, June 15, 1999.	VII-C-22
05.19.99	SHA	USFWS	USFWS concurrence on amendment to Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, May 25, 1999.	VII-C-23
05.19.99	SHA	National Park Service	NPS concurrence on amendment to Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, May 25, 1999.	VII-C-24
05.19.99	SHA	MDE - Water Management Administration	MDE concurrence on amendment to Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, July 14, 1999.	VII-C-25

C. Streamlined Process Agency Correspondence (Continued)

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
05.19.99	SHA	MD DNR	DNR concurrence (with comments attached) on amendment to Alternates Retained for Detailed Study, June 22, 1999.	VII-C-26
06.22.99	MD DNR	SHA	Response to concurrence: no comments on the amendment.	VII-C-27
04.26.02	EPA	SHA	Response to air quality review	VII-C-28

D. Elected Officials

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
11.04.93	SHA	Frederick County Commissioners	Response to comment regarding the improvements at New Design Road.	VII-D-1
08.30.94	US House of Representatives	SHA	Requesting information on long range plans to address the congestive along I-270.	VII-D-2
09.23.94	SHA	US House of Representatives	Response to August 30, 1994 letter.	VII-D-3
10.31.97	Gaithersburg City Council	Governor of Maryland	Regarding Gaithersburg transportation issues including smart growth issues.	VII-D-4
12.04.97	Governor of Maryland	Gaithersburg City Council	Response to October 31, 1997 letter.	VII-D-5
02.17.98	SHA	MD House of Delegates	Response to concerns regarding funding for the I-70/I-270 interchange.	VII-D-6
03.12.98	Senate of Maryland	SHA	Concerns with proposed changes to the I-270/MD-124 interchange including park-and-ride lot locations.	VII-D-7
04.08.98	SHA	Senate of Maryland	Response to March 12, 1998 letter.	VII-D-8
04.10.98	City of Rockville	MDOT	Regarding the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) alignment in the Shady Grove area of Rockville.	VII-D-9
04.24.98	MDOT	City of Rockville	Response to April 10, 1998 letter.	VII-D-10
05.05.98	SHA	City of Gaithersburg	Regarding city's efforts to revitalize downtown Gaithersburg.	VII-D-11
06.12.98	SHA	City of Gaithersburg	Regarding the proposed I-270/Watkins Mill Road interchange.	VII-D-12
07.31.98	SHA	City of Gaithersburg	Regarding potential for joint use at park and ride lot locations.	VII-D-13
09.09.98	SHA	Senate of Maryland	Review of project milestones schedule.	VII-D-14
11.16.99	SHA	Senate of Maryland	Regarding request for evaluation of an interchange at I-270 and Gude Drive.	VII-D-15
03.18.99	Senate of Maryland	SHA	Request for review and comments regarding the MD-26/US-15 interchange.	VII-D-16
03.16.99	Worman's Mill Civic Association	Senate of Maryland	Request regarding the MD-26/US-15 interchange.	VII-D-17
04.01.99	SHA	Senate of Maryland	Regarding proposed MD-26/US-15 interchange.	VII-D-18
10.10.99	City of Frederick	SHA	Regarding traffic concerns within the City and a MD 26/US 15 interchange.	VII-D-19
10.25.99	SHA	City of Frederick	Response to October 10, 1999 letter.	VII-D-20
10.22.99	SHA	Frederick County Commissioner	Regarding development access to US 15.	VII-D-21

D. Elected Officials (Continued)

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
02.08.00	SHA	Maryland House of Delegates	Regarding HOV lanes.	VII-D-22
04.04.00	SHA	Montgomery County Council	Information regarding long term strategies for improving the congestion along I-270/US 15 corridor.	VII-D-23
04.06.00	MD House of Delegates	SHA	Forwarded citizen email concerning traffic congestion on I-270.	VII-D-24
05.01.00	SHA	MD House of Delegates	Response to April 6, 2000 citizen letter.	VII-D-26
06.22.00	SHA	MD House of Delegates	Response to concerns regarding MD 85 interchange improvements, HOV lanes and transit.	VII-D-28
07.17.00	MD House of Delegates	SHA	Concerns regarding transit, transit ridership and the MWCOG travel projection model.	VII-D-30
08.01.00	MDOT	MD House of Delegates	Response to July 17, 2000 letter.	VII-D-32
07.31.00	SHA	City of Frederick	Concerns regarding traffic operations along US 15 at Hayward Road/Worman's Mill Road; specifically related to recent accident experience and SHA efforts to address this issue.	VII-D-33
11.21.00	SHA	Frederick County State Delegation	Response to concerns regarding the US-40 Alternate project in Middletown and the US 15/MD 26 project.	VII-D-34
Not dated	SHA	Montgomery County Council	Response to question raised at the October 22 briefing to the Montgomery County Council, Transportation and Environment Committee.	VII-D-35
06.01.01	SHA	MD House of Delegates	Review of project history and milestones.	VII-D-37

E. Minutes

Date	From	To	Subject	Page #
Undated	SHA	Internal	Interagency Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-1
Undated	SHA	Internal	Interagency Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-8
Undated	SHA	Internal	Interagency Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-12
10.21.98	SHA	Internal	Interagency Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-14
12.16.98	SHA	Internal	Interagency Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-16
01.17.01	SHA	Internal	Interagency Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-20
06.20.01	SHA	Internal	Interagency Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-21
02.21.02	SHA	Internal	07.17.01 Department of Natural Resources Coordination Meeting Minutes	VII-E-23
02.21.02	SHA	Internal	09.05.01M-NCPPC Coordination Meeting Minutes	VII-E-25
08.22.01	SHA	Internal	06.11.01 National Park Service Coordination Meeting Minutes	VII-E-27
02.25.02	SHA	Internal	11.01.01 National Park Service Coordination Meeting Minutes	VII-E-30
03.01.96	SHA	Internal	11.13.95 Interagency Field Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-32
05.21.97	SHA	Interagency Review Team	Invitation for an Interagency Field Review	VII-E-34
05.22.97	SHA	Internal	05.01.97 Bus Tour Minutes	VII-E-35
08.26.97	SHA	Internal	07.25.97 Interagency Field Review Meeting Minutes	VII-E-38
06.18.01	SHA	Internal	Agency Field Review of Potential Wetland Mitigation Sites held 04.25.01, 04.26.01, 05.02.01 and 05.03.01	VII-E-42